

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of October 31, 2008 is respectfully requested.

By this amendment claims 31 and 33 have been amended, claims 1-30, 32, and 34-74 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein, and claims 75-92 have been added. Claims 31, 33, and 75-92 are now pending in the application. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

The specification has been reviewed and revised. No new matter has been added by these revisions. Entry of the specification amendments is thus respectfully requested.

II. Prior Art Rejections

Currently, claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Kageyama (US 6,333,790) and claims 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kageyama in view of Adams et al. (US 5,778,226).

Claim 31 is patentable over Kageyama and Adams et al., whether taken alone or in combination, because it requires a communication apparatus comprising, in part, a receiving unit operable to receive response information transmitted from the printing apparatus and a display unit operable to display information relating to the printing apparatus based on the response information received by the receiving unit, wherein the response information includes a first field indicating information indicating an occurrence of at least one event detected by the printing apparatus, a second field indicating a type of a character code for a message relating to the at

least one event, a third field indicating a length of the message, and a variable-length field for storing the message.

As acknowledged in the Office Action, Kageyama fails to disclose a receiving unit operable to receive response information transmitted from the printing apparatus, the response information a first field indicating information indicating the occurrence of at least one event detected by the printing apparatus, a second field indicating a type of a character code for a message relating to the at least one event, a third field indicating a length of the message, and a variable-length field for storing the message. (Office Action, page 5, lines 5-8.) Adams also fails to disclose these limitations.

Adams discloses a driver, which is a software program. (column 1, lines 14-22.) Adams does not disclose receiving any of the response information in claim 31 *from a printing apparatus*. To the contrary, Adams et al. discloses that a “kernel and linked description tables” are stored on the computer. (column 1, line 67 - column 2, line 2.) The Office Action equates Tables 2 at column 57 of Adams et al. to the response information of claim 31. However, Adams et al. provides that the error codes of Table 2 are generated *by the description tables* (column 57, lines 29-30) which are stored *on the computer* (column 1, line 67 - column 2, line 2). As such, neither Adams et al. nor Kageyama discloses the response information transmitted from the printing apparatus as required by claim 31. Further, if the driver of Adams et al. was installed on the computer of Kageyama, the kernel and description tables of Adams et al. would be on the computer of Kageyama and would not be received from the printing apparatus. As such, Kageyama and Adams et al. fail to meet the requirements of claim 31.

Further, neither Kageyama nor Adams et al. disclose "the first field consisting of a plurality of bits, each bit of said plurality of bits indicating whether or not an event of said at least one event has occurred." Neither Kageyama nor Adams et al. discloses one bit indicating the occurrence of an event. As such, Kageyama and Adams et al. fail to meet the requirements of claim 31.

It is thus submitted that the invention of the current application, as defined in claim 31, is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, and yields significant advantages over the prior art. Allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 33, 75, and 86-90 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 31 and are thus allowable for at least the reasons set forth above in support of claim 31. Claims 76-85 each also require response information transmitted from a printing apparatus to a receiving unit not disclosed by Kageyama or Adams et al., and are thus allowable for the reasons set forth above in support of claim 31.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, inasmuch as all of the outstanding issues have been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in complete condition for issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance, and action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain after consideration of the within response, however, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at his convenience.

If any fee beyond that submitted herewith, or extension of time is required to obtain entry of this Amendment, the undersigned hereby petitions the Commissioner to grant any necessary time extension and authorizes charging Deposit Account 23-0975 for any such fee not submitted herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

Takashi NAKANISHI et al.

/Andrew D. St.Clair/

By: 2009.03.04 16:07:32 -05'00'

Andrew D. St.Clair
Registration No. 58,739
Attorney for Applicants

ADS/DMO/rgf
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 4, 2009